



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/585,729	07/12/2006	Tadashi Maeda	043890-0927	7206
20277 7590 04/01/2009 MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP 600 13TH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096				
EXAMINER				
ABDEL RAHMAN, AHMED				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1793				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/01/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/585,729

Applicant(s)

MAEDA ET AL.

Examiner

AHMED ABDEL RAHMAN

Art Unit

1793

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-3 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/US)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01/05/2009
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment of February 13, 2009 has been received and entered. With the present amendment, claims 1-3 are withdrawn, claim 4 was amended, claim 7 was added. Claims 4-7 are pending.

Specification

2. The objection of the abstract has been withdrawn due to applicant's arguments and amendments filed on February 13, 2009.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 4-7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda et al (US 6, 189, 771) in view of Mei (US 6,680, 128), and further in view of the collective teachings of Kodas (US 6951666) and Kang et al (US 5,837,119).

In regards to claims 4, Maeda teaches a method for soldering a first electrode with a solder portion to a second electrode, as observed in the sequences depicted in figures 3A-3E, where electrode 18 and electrode 12 are the first and second electrode, respectively, using a metal (solder) paste that is coated with flux comprising either tin, lead, zing, gold, silver, copper, antimony, indium, or bismuth filled between the soldering portion and the second electrode by positioning the first electrode directly above the second electrode where the metal paste is within the cavity (metal paste 5, figures 3A-3E). Where the electronic component, or substrate, is then fed to the reflow process allowing the molten solder from the solder ball to wet the metal particles of the metal paste which in turn wets the surface of the electrodes, followed by solidifying the melted solder to form a solder bump which allows for good bonding and electrical connection (column 4, lines 23-35).

Maeda teaches that the metal paste is made by mixing a metal and flux (column 4, lines 1-4). However, Maeda fails to teach that the paste includes a liquid basis formed of resin component, an activator removing oxide film produced on surfaces of the solder portion, *a metal powder having at least flake-like shaped metal powder* including a core metal and a surface metal to cover surfaces of the core metal, as well as the metal powder having at least a flake-like shaped figure.

However, Mei teaches solder pastes where a particular solder composition is most preferably a metal allow of tin and zinc (core metal) coated with a material preferably selected from copper, silver, palladium, tin, or gold (Column 2, lines 19-24). Mei also teaches that the coated solder composition used in the solder paste is also suitable for being combined with a flux containing a rosin, derivatives of a rosin such as a dimerized resin, an activator, and a solvent (Column 4, lines 40-49), thus the paste would have a sense of liquidity (liquid basis). Where the solder composition is mixed with the flux to form a roughly 50-50 mix of flux and solder composition (column 4, lines 60-62), thus for it to be a paste it would be necessarily inherent that the paste would have liquidity since, in regards to the particular limitation of claim 4, reciting that the surface metal would be dissolved into the core metal, this would inherently happen depending on the thickness of the surface metal that is coating the core since it is exposed to the reflow process directly (column 4, lines 8-11).

In view of Mei's teachings, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine, with Maeda's soldering method that solders together two electrodes by a soldering bump through the use of a soldering paste, a particular soldering paste that contains a core and surface metal, since using a paste that contains a core and surface metal would allow for lower melting points, longer shelf life, and better effective wettability properties (Mei, Column 3, lines 5-10).

Kodas teaches the use of metal powders that have a flaky form with very large aspect ratios (column 4, lines 60-66) to form conductive features (column 35, lines 1-18). Where according to Kang et al, soldering or electrically conductive pastes (column 2, lines 20-25) with metal powders in the flaky form because of their higher aspect ratios are more desirable than

metal powder in the regular spherical form because flaky powders provide for better electrical conduction because of their larger aspect ratios, i.e. length of the flake is larger than the width of the flake (Kang, column 5, lines 35-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Maeda in view of Mei to use flake-like metal powders since their higher aspect ratios allow for better electrical conduction, as taught by the collective teachings of Kodas and Kang.

In regards to claim 5, Wherein the core metal is selected from the group of tin, zinc, lead, and indium, and the surface metal includes any one of gold and silver, Mei teaches that the solder composition (core metal) can be either tin or zinc, while the coating material (surface metal) can be either copper, silver, palladium, tin, or gold (Column 2, lines 19-24).

In regards to claim 6: wherein the core metal includes tin or tin-based alloy, and the surface metal includes silver (Mei, column 2, lines 19-24).

In regards to claim 7: The soldering paste of claim 4, wherein amount of the metal powder is 1-20 vol % (Kodas, column 35, lines 1-15, where the precursor composition is the soldering paste and includes metals such as silver (metal particle, column 24, lines 35-38, where it is mentioned before that these particles may be flakes) and tin (molecular metal precursor, column 24, line 37) used for solder replacements or high conductive features (column 35, lines 10-16), and where

Kodas discloses that the precursor composition includes between 20 and 50% vol percent metal powder (column 27, lines 62-67), thus rendering the instant claim obvious.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments, see pages 5 and 6 of applicants remarks, filed February 13, 2009, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of applicant's amendment to claim 4, and the addition of the newly added claim. Examiner notes applicant's argument in regards to Maeda failing to teach a flake-like shaped metal powder as well as Mai failing to modify this limitation, however examiner has shown that the use of flake-like shaped metal powders is well known in the art and is commonly used for high conductivity methods, as taught by the newly cited collective teachings of Kodas and Kang. In regards to the newly added claim, the examiner has shown within the disclosure of Kodas that the newly added claim is unpatentable and obvious over Maeda in view of Kodas and Mai. Thus, due to all claims being dependent upon claim 4, all dependent claims (claims 5-7), including the independent claim (claim 4) are rejected under 35. U.S.C. 103 (a) obviousness over Maeda in view of Mai and Kodas.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AHMED ABDEL RAHMAN whose telephone number is (571)270-5931. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jessica Ward can be reached on (571)272-1223. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/AHMED ABDEL RAHMAN/
Examiner, Art Unit 1793

/Jessica L. Ward/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793